

THE  
COMMON SCHOOL JOURNAL.

NEW SERIES.

WM. B. FOWLE, EDITOR.

**VOL. XII.**

BOSTON, APRIL 1, 1850.

**NO. 7.**

EARLY DISCIPLINE IN NEW ENGLAND.

The following quaint but sensible rules for the government of children, are said to have been written by Michael Wigglesworth, Pastor of the first church in Malden, who wrote a poem, which has been reprinted even in our day, entitled "The Day of Doom." From him descended Professors Wigglesworth, father and son, who, in their day, were the ornaments of Harvard College, and whose descendants are among the most respectable citizens of Boston. It is not every writer of precepts that can point to his descendants for four or five generations, with so much confidence. Little is known of Michael, except that he was graduated in 1651, and died in 1705, aged 73. He was useful as a physician as well as a minister, and the poem alluded to was written when sickness obliged him for a time to suspend his ministerial labors. The following directions were probably written soon after his settlement in Malden, nearly two hundred years ago. They are valuable as showing the ideas of education which then prevailed; and they are printed, as nearly as the types will admit, just as they are contracted and punctuated in the manuscript. In two or three instances, when the manuscript could not be deciphered the dashes (— — —) mark that words are omitted.—Ed.

FAMILY GOVERNMENT.

Dutys of Christian parēts to their childrē, w<sup>ch</sup> may be reduced to these principal heads.

1 Rule. It is y<sup>e</sup> duty of parēts to endeav<sup>r</sup> to bring y<sup>r</sup> childrē w<sup>th</sup> in y<sup>e</sup> cōpass of the covenant.

Here, 1: Let y<sup>m</sup> labo<sup>r</sup> to be in coven<sup>t</sup> with God thēselves, who will entertain theirs with them.

2: Present them to baptism (y<sup>e</sup> soul of y<sup>e</sup> coven<sup>t</sup>) with conveniēt speed.

3: Give y<sup>m</sup> good names.

2 Rule. To Love y<sup>m</sup> { not inordinately, or w<sup>th</sup> a cockering  
dearly; yet { blind affection.  
2ly. In prudēce to conceal y<sup>r</sup> love, so  
as not to embolden y<sup>m</sup> in evill.

3 Rule. To pittie and pray for y<sup>m</sup>

1: Let parēts bewayl y<sup>e</sup> corruptiō of nature ppagated by y<sup>r</sup> childrē.

2: Let y<sup>m</sup> bewayl y<sup>r</sup> own personal evils & pray y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>r</sup> childrē may not inherit their corruptions.

3: Let y<sup>m</sup> earnestly begg a blessing upō all means for their good & y<sup>t</sup> they may be sanctify'd by grace frō their tender years.

4 Rule. That they nourish y<sup>m</sup> sobly; i. e. maintain y<sup>m</sup> according to their ability & rank, with moderatiō, without excess.

Allowing them	{	Food	{	Wholesom
			{	Seasonable
			{	enough
		Apparel	{	Honest
			{	comely
			{	comfortable
		With oth necessary's.		

5 Rule. To keep them under obediēce

Directions. 1: Hold thy childrē in awe

2: Labor that their awe may proceed frō love rath then servile fear.

3: Let your Government be upright, Loving, Even (alway like itself not chāgeable) Equall (to all alike) ever moderate or free frō rigo<sup>r</sup>.

6 Rule. To train them up in { Godliness  
{ Good manners  
Train y<sup>m</sup> up, that is { Teach them  
{ See that they practise

1: In Godliness. Here in generall Begin to plant v<sup>t</sup>ue, and weed out any apparēt vice betimes.

1. Teach y<sup>m</sup> to pray to god morning & evening.

2. To give thanks before and after meat.

3. To rehears y<sup>e</sup> Lordes prayer 10 cōmandmts & y<sup>e</sup> creed.

4ly Catechiz<sup>s</sup> y<sup>m</sup> according to y<sup>r</sup> capacity more largely in points of religion.

5ly Accustom y<sup>m</sup> to read y<sup>e</sup> scriptures daly.

6ly Restrain y<sup>m</sup> frō evill courses by yo<sup>r</sup> parētall authority

7ly Keep<sup>s</sup> y<sup>m</sup> frō evil cōpanions.

8ly If y<sup>e</sup> put y<sup>m</sup> out, place them with religi<sup>s</sup> mast<sup>r</sup>.

9ly To help their proficiēcy teach y<sup>m</sup> to read & write.

10 Comend and make much of y<sup>m</sup> for well-doing

11 Countenāce not their shrewd tricks, no not with a smile Sin is no laughing matter.

12 Couſel, exhort, & warn them often.

13 Keep y<sup>m</sup> frō idlenes, inure y<sup>m</sup> to diligēce in a particular calling.

II Train them up in Good Māners ; teaching them In speech

To call their bett<sup>rs</sup> by Revnd & honāble names

To speak modestly of y<sup>m</sup> selves.

To salute not only y<sup>r</sup> acquaintāce but all Christians wishing them well

To be thankfull for benefits received

To acknowledge an offence craving pardon

To give y<sup>r</sup> betters leave to speak before y<sup>m</sup>

To keep silence while their betters are in place till they be called to speak, or have asked & obtained leave to speak

Not to be loud nor full of words when they do speak

Not to interrupt oth<sup>r</sup> in speaking but to give an interco<sup>d</sup> of speech to others.

He that will have all y<sup>e</sup> talk to— —

— — — of good maners.

#### In Gesture

To meet such as are coming tow'd them. Gen. 18 : 2

To rise up to their elders.

To stand while their betters are sitting in place, G. 18.

To bend the knee in token of humility or subjection 1 K. 2. 19

To give y<sup>e</sup> chief place to betters and offer it in curtesy to equalls.

#### Hinderāces of good education

Parēt's { Ignorance  
Prophanes  
Niggardice  
Cockering

#### Helps to good education

1. Suffer y<sup>m</sup> not to have their own will. Pr. 29. 15

2. Moderation in diet: not to pamper y<sup>m</sup> w<sup>th</sup> too much or too delicate
3. Not to cloath y<sup>m</sup> w<sup>th</sup> costly Apparel or attire y<sup>m</sup> w<sup>th</sup> new fashiōs Z. 1. 8
4. Rebuke them when they do amiss
5. Correct them

7th Rule. Go before them in a good example Instructions  
w<sup>th</sup> out examples are a dead Doctrine

8 Rule. By all means } as { Shun partiality  
maintain love among } a {  
childrē } means { Use equality } in ordinary  
usage in  
distribution  
of goods

9 Rule. Provide beforehand for y<sup>r</sup> after cōfort w<sup>n</sup> they cōe  
to get up familiys of their own

1. Learn y<sup>m</sup> sōe honest calling { Mechanicall { w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>y</sup> are  
or { most apt  
Liberall { for
2. To give y<sup>m</sup> portōns accord: to y<sup>r</sup> ability & to y<sup>t</sup> end to lay up someth: for y<sup>m</sup>
3. To give y<sup>e</sup> eldest son a double portōn, nor lightly to disinherit y<sup>m</sup>
4. To provide godly & sutable matches for y<sup>m</sup>.
5. For — — — they may not chuse whith y<sup>y</sup> shall marry at all or no, or w<sup>th</sup> w<sup>m</sup> ag<sup>st</sup> their liking, turning y<sup>r</sup> authority into tyranny y<sup>t</sup> their own will should stand for a law in this busines.

## PLYMOUTH COUNTY TEACHERS' CONVENTION.

Some friend has sent us the Old Colony Memorial, which contains an interesting account of a meeting to form an Association for Plymouth County. Besides this act, which secures the bounty of the State, the meeting appears to have been one of unusual activity and usefulness. Mr. Tillinghast, the excellent Principal of the Bridgewater Normal School, was elected President, and we see among the names of the other officers several, which are a sufficient guarantee for the continued usefulness of the Association. We believe that most of the Counties have now formed Associations, and the enginery, which is to raise teachers to their proper rank, is getting into operation. The Plymouth Association passed several *resolutions*, but we so seldom find any *resolution* in such expressions of opinion, that we almost consider the word, as applied to them, a misnomer. One of the *motions* had for its object the proposing of a general meeting of all the county associations. This may be well enough, when the County

Conventions have had some experience in their several spheres, but we should prefer to see them for the present *working down* to the towns and districts, for there, and not on the grand scale, the important work is to be performed. We have the American Institute of Instruction, and the Massachusetts Association of Teachers, which seem to claim as much time as teachers can spare, and we do not see why they can not accomplish all that can be expected from the proposed General Convention. We have all heard of the universal philanthropist whose charity was so extended that it overlooked a perishing neighbor.

---

### LET IT COME.

BY WALTER WILWOOD.

Let it come and be not fearful  
What another day may bring ;  
For the heart that's always cheerful  
Feels not half of sorrow's sting.  
Grief's dark reign is always sterner,  
When he finds an easier prey,  
Than when he finds some smiling mourner,  
Ill disposed to brook his sway.

Let it come, nor idly murmur  
At the many ills of life ;  
As its trials thicken, firmer  
Gird your armor for the strife.  
In the tide of time before you  
Good and ill for all are held ;  
But the good will not pursue you  
Till by earnest force compelled.

Let it come, and be not fearful  
What the flight of time will bring ;  
Visions bright and spectres fearful  
Are behind his shading wing ;  
And to all, as past he flieth,  
Their allotted part he bears ;  
But his burden lightest lieth  
On the heart that ne'er despairs.

Let it come, nor be offended  
Should the sky be overcast,  
And its light again be blended  
With the shadows of the past.  
Still with hopes of brighter morrow  
Cheer your fainting spirit some ;  
And even though it bring you sorrow,  
Stand erect,—and let it come.

## PUNCTUATION. NO. VI.

Our readers may, perhaps, recollect that, in previous numbers, we have once or twice alluded to the system of punctuation proposed by Professor Mandeville, of New York. In alluding to this system, we undoubtedly intended to express our dissent from it, but by no means to misrepresent it. Just as our last number was issuing from the press, we received a communication from the gentleman above-mentioned, complaining of the injustice which, he thinks, we have done to him, and claiming its publication in the Journal.

The article, however, is too long for our Journal, and we regret that it is so, for the parts that we shall be obliged to omit are very amusing, though not necessary to the main object, the correction of our supposed mistakes in regard to the Professor's System of Punctuation.

---

*For the Editor of the Common School Journal,*

In Nos. 3 and 4 of your valuable Journal,\* placed in my hands by a friend, I perceive that you have introduced my name in connection with the subject of punctuation; and after having, as you seem to think, shown the absurdity of at least some of the rules\* comprised in the system of which I am the author, you caution your readers against adopting it; or, to employ your own terms, "you advise" them "by all means to avoid it." Without complaining of this advice, for I have no doubt it was honestly given, I could have wished that instead of giving your impressions of my system of punctuation, you had adduced my rules in my own language, with my examples subjoined illustrating them; for neglecting to do this, and assuming a more accurate knowledge than in the result, you seem to possess, you have fallen into some capital errors; and inadvertently have done me great injustice: having in fact, in every instance in which I am noticed, represented me as punctuating, as I have nowhere in my work prescribed; and consequently placing me before your numerous readers under lights fitted to make them wholly mistake me as an author in that branch of knowledge which formed the subject of your dissertations. Relying therefore on your sense of justice as well as your known courtesy, I have taken the liberty to send you this paper for insertion in the Journal at an early day. I should belie all I know by personal intercourse, and all I have learned from the intercourse of others, did I not believe you as prompt to repair an injury, as unwilling knowingly to commit one.

*First* then, you speak of me as having "published a sys-

\* The punctuation is the Professor's and not ours.

tem of reading based mainly on a classification of sentences *by punctuation*." The italics are mine. You err here in representing me as making punctuation the basis alike of a classification of sentences and of reading. The truth is, that my rules both for punctuation and reading, are derivations from my classification of sentences. Reasoning from antecedent probabilities and a few facts which caught my attention, I reached the conclusion, that if reliable laws for reading could be found anywhere, they would be found in a careful analysis of the sentential structure of the English language; and acting on this supposition, I began a laborious and protracted examination sentence by sentence of the best English writers native and foreign: Extending my investigation to between two hundred and fifty and three hundred volumes in every department of English literature. In this way I not merely exhausted the varieties of structure, but accumulated, under each in a large Merchant's ledger purchased for the purpose, very numerous examples, covering frequently eight or ten folio pages. Observe, I was endeavoring to obtain laws of reading: punctuation had not entered my mind. But I was struck by the circumstance, as I was one day turning over the leaves of my ledger, that the punctuation of most of the examples of the same variety was the same; and that, in fact, the leaves of my ledger presented an appearance not unlike that of the printed page, when a series of divisions between words happen to fall below each other, and so form a break, irregular it may be, but continuous from the top to the bottom. The circumstance was suggestive: it first made me suspect a connection between structure and punctuation. Being engrossed however by my leading object, (to find in structure laws of delivery, if they existed there,) I deferred further consideration of the subject until a more propitious moment. Subsequently I returned to it, and my laws of punctuation are the result; which laws are really nothing more than a rigid induction, from eight tenths of the mass of examples collected in my ledger, afterwards extended to a large number of literary works of the first class, published at different periods, and both in this country and in England.

Instead of its being true then that "I have published a system of reading based mainly on a classification *by punctuation*," nearly the reverse of this is the truth. The classification is the basis both of reading *and* punctuation; or, in other words, it is the premise from which both alike are conclusions: the realm of facts from which both, by an induction, as wide, as cautious, as thorough, as was ever prosecuted, have been drawn. But passing from general to particular,

*Secondly*, You have been equally unhappy in your illus-

tration of my rule for the use of the colon. The rule itself you state with sufficient accuracy. You clearly imply at least, that between parts making perfect sense and having the connection understood, I place the *colon*; but you add "where we have placed semicolons, he would place colons, and where we have placed the comma before *and*, he would place a semicolon." The example to which you refer in this remark is as follows:

Let an old man play the part of a youth, when in company with the aged; let the decorations be rural, though the scene be a palace; let the dress be unsuited to the age or the character, though ever so rich, and the impropriety will at once be seen.

You are singularly unfortunate here; for you have stumbled on a sentence for illustration which does not make perfect sense, at any point, until the end is reached; and this, had you been as well versed in the laws of sentential structure, as I need assure no one acquainted with you, you are in many other things perhaps of greater importance, you would have seen at a glance. It is a sentence which we call single compact, 3rd. form, 3rd. variety: compact, because it consists of two parts beginning with correlative words; (if—then;) 3rd. form, because both of these correlatives are understood; and 3rd. variety, because *and* is substituted between the parts for the last correlative. The sentence in its regular form would read thus: "*If* you let an old man &c., *then* the impropriety" &c. Of course, as soon as the correlatives involved, are expressed, the impossibility of perfect sense before the end of the sentence, is demonstrated; and the proper punctuation is neither a semicolon or colon, but the comma; though by the first law of deviation laid down in my work, p. 43, your punctuation with the semicolon, while unnecessary, is yet admissible. Such being the true punctuation, what must your readers believing you informed on the subject of which you speak, think of one, thus represented by you as "placing colons where you have placed semicolons, and a semicolon where you have placed a comma" between members of imperfect sense! or, what is more affecting to me than my own unhappiness, astride of the colons on which you have mounted me, what will your more discerning readers think of *you*, when they discover to their astonishment in your remarks on the example quoted, your inability to distinguish perfect and imperfect sense! you, the editor of the Common School Journal of MASSACHUSETTS!! [See note.]

But to your next attempt to illustrate my rule for the use of the colon. It is not less felicitous than the one just dismissed. You adduce the following sentence, first puncta-

ated as you think it should be, if the colon were used, then as you would punctuate without the colon, and finally as I should punctuate with that pause, if I conformed to my rule ; that is, "*If we understand it.*"

1. "In virtue, they were alike ; in oratory there was some difference : one was more concise ; the other more diffuse : one more constrained ; the other more free : the one (more) keen ; the other, (more) weighty : from one nothing could be spared ; to the other, nothing could be added : in the one, more of care ; in the other, more of nature."

2. "In virtue they were alike, in oratory there was some difference ; one was more concise, the other more diffuse ; one more constrained, the other more free ; the one (more) keen,—the other (more) weighty ; from one nothing could be spared ; to the other nothing could be added ; in the one more of care,—in the other, more of nature."

3. "In virtue, they were alike : in oratory, there was some difference : one was more concise : the other more diffuse : one more constrained : the other more free : the one, keen : the other, more weighty : from one, nothing could be spared : to the other nothing could be added : in the one more of care : in the other more of nature."

Evidently, my dear sir, "We [did *not*] understand it." You have again confounded perfect and imperfect sense ; for the parts beginning with "one" and the "other," not *separately*, but *together* form perfect sense. As before, they are parts of single compact sentences of the 3rd. form, with both of the correlatives suppressed : the correlatives *indeed—but, though—yet*, or, which I prefer, *if—yet*. Supply these and imperfect sense will be demonstrated. "If the one was more concise, yet the other was more diffuse" &c. Having then imperfect sense at *concise*, the comma, (see my rule for use of the comma,) is, strictly speaking, the proper punctuation ; but where both correlatives are understood, as in the present instance, the punctuation is exceptive, and falls under a rule for the insertion of the semicolon, laid down with special reference to this case under single compact sentences, punctuation. See "Elements of Reading and Oratory" p. 75.

But you may differ with me, as to imperfect sense at *concise* and the corresponding places. Be it so. Still you *must* admit, even on the supposition of perfect sense at these points, that the sentence contains principal and sub-parts in the same circumstances ; that is, with the connectives in both cases understood, and hence requiring the same punctuation. Now if you will turn to my "Elements of Reading and Oratory" p. 45, you will find there a general rule, which prescribes, in all such cases, the insertion of the colon between the principal parts and the semicolon between the sub-parts : the very punctuation you yourself have declared proper with the colon in use.

I present you, then, the horns of a dilemma, by the one or the other of which, my friend, you will be inevitably gored.

Admit imperfect sense at the points specified, and you are wrong; or affirm perfect sense at the same points, and you are equally wrong, in imputing to me the punctuation in your third example as being in conformity with my rules. I repeat, (regretfully, sadly indeed, for it gives me no pleasure, I can assure you, to see the proportions of so goodly a man marred,) adopt which of the alternatives, you please, you are gored. The sentence as first punctuated above, is in the main, a fair exhibition of my punctuation. I might prefer the colon after *alike*, and I should certainly insert the comma after *oratory*, and also after *other* in every instance; but in other respects, the sentence is punctuated precisely as I would punctuate it.

And now having disclaimed in terms sufficiently emphatic the punctuation which you ascribe to me, it may be thought I have achieved enough to retire with credit from the field. He who thinks so, forgets that ambition like other passions, "grows by what it feeds on." One achievement suggests another; and, (to cut the matter short,) I wish, in the third place to break a lance with you on the general merits of the colon as a pause of sense; or a very sensible pause."

NOTE.—We are sorry to see the Professor galled by riding "astride of the colons," but we feel no uneasiness at our own position. We endeavored to punctuate according to the rules of another person, as we understood his *rules*, and not as we understood the sentence. Our author says,

"The *Semicolon* properly separates the parts of a sentence making perfect sense; or distinct though related propositions, connected by conjunctions, adverbs, or relative pronouns *expressed*."

"The sense is known to be perfect when, a period being inserted at a given point, what *succeeds* makes sense; or forms a distinct proposition."

"By a proposition is meant that assemblage of words or members which is necessary to a complete thought: in other words, a proposition is a series of words expressing a complete thought."

Now we maintain still, that, by these rules, there is "a complete thought" in the following sentence, which would succeed a period placed after *aged*.

"Let the decorations be rural, though the scene be a palace; let the dress be unsuited to the age or the character, though ever so rich; and the impropriety will at once be seen."

Nay, there is a complete thought, though not a complete sentence, in the words,

"Let an old man play the part of a youth, when in company with the aged."

But, no conjunction, adverb, or relative pronoun connects these propositions ; and, to meet this case, we have the following rule of our author.

"The *colon* properly separates the parts of a sentence, making perfect sense ; or distinct though related propositions connected by conjunctions, adverbs or relative pronouns, *understood*." Then the author adds, "In the suppression of the connectives lies the only rational or even imaginable distinction between the colon and semicolon. By this suppression alone, is the connection between the parts of a sentence, in which either of them may be employed, made less close, and a longer pause than the semicolon, necessary ; and then a longer pause is necessary : a fact which printers of the present day, *who almost universally dispense with the use of the colon*, seem to have forgotten, or studiously to neglect."

On this basis, we remarked, that the author would place the colon after *aged* and *palace*, and so, we believe, ninety-nine of every hundred teachers would have supposed. But we are now told, that this sentence, these propositions, can not come under the rules above mentioned, because the sentence is what the author somewhere else calls "single compact, third form, third variety : *compact*, because it consists of two parts beginning with correlative words ; (*if—then* ;) third form, because both of these correlatives are understood ; (!) and third variety, because *and* is substituted between the parts for the last correlative (!) The sentence in its regular form would read thus :

"If you let an old man, &c., &c.,—then the impropriety will at once be seen."

Now, we maintain that there is no need of the correlatives, the word *and*, expressed, and correctly so, precludes their introduction, and the author has no right to *change* a sentence in this manner to warp it into his system. But, if this is to be done, before the teacher or the pupil can determine what the punctuation should be, we ask no further proof that, in cautioning the present race of District school teachers to beware of it, we did them a service for which we are entitled to their thanks.

The other sentence, which is quoted from the Journal, less carefully than it should be, is of the same character, and the remarks we have made will apply to it also. There is a positive declaration that, "In virtue they were alike, in oratory there was some difference," &c. There is no *if* about it, no condition, no doubt. Had the learned author told us that *yet* and *but* were nearly synonymous, and either might have been introduced before the second clause of each antithesis, there would have been some reason in the remark, for the sense is not altered by saying,

"In virtue, they were alike, but (or yet) in oratory there was some difference, &c."

And then the *connective* being *expressed*, his rules would place a semicolon where we have placed the comma, before *but*.

We have made these remarks to show that, if we are unable to distinguish what our author means by perfect and imperfect sense, it is not so much because we lack understanding, as because his rules lack simplicity, and, what is more important,—truth. We will add that, if the Professor would throw his system to the dogs, and *read* to the young teachers, and make them imitate his reading, we know no man who could do them so much good, but it is still our deliberate opinion that they will never use his system, because they are not prepared to understand it, and the best proof of this is our own wandering in the premises.

---

[For the Common School Journal.]

#### COMMON SCHOOLS.

That the progress of the cause of popular Education, depends very much on the qualifications and labors of Teachers is obvious, but that it depends wholly on them, is an absurd and mischievous idea. The Teacher should indeed be the head of his school, but what can the head do without the co-operation of the body? For one, I would heartily join in that noble movement, which has for its object the elevation of Teachers, and if I may speak for that class, in whose department of labor I have had a little experience, I will acknowledge that our deficiencies are many and great; and that, when we consider how few of our fondest hopes are realized, and how far short we fall of that standard of excellence, which we would fain adopt in our vocation, even our best endeavors are unsatisfactory. Yet I feel a pride in believing, that Teachers, as a class, are not only pioneers in the great work of popular Education, but are *very far in advance* of other portions of (the) community.

The very nature of their calling, their duties, their responsibilities, and the very difficulties they must daily meet, serve to arouse their energies, and to stimulate them onward.

But the Teacher's motives are unappreciated, thankless are his toils, and *failure* is too often the result of his best efforts. And why a failure? Simply because parents do not do their duty. Parents are *behind-hand* in the work of education. Let parents enter into the work as earnestly, as prayerfully, as laboriously as teachers do at this day, and happy for them, and for the world, would be the result.

But how is it now? The teacher is employed, and the school *abandoned* to his charge. He enters it with exalted views of Education, with a fearful sense of his responsibilities, and with a soul bowed in prayer to God for the divine blessing on the labors of the day. Were his pupils but properly fitted for his hands by the right kind of home preparation, what might we not expect from such a school? But alas! few of his pupils are so fitted.

His wreck of a school-house is, perhaps, crowded with scholars of all ages, from twenty-one years, downwards; many of them uncultivated and ill-bred, vicious in their habits, impertinent and awkward in their manners, the pampered pets of parental indulgence, and the self-conceited *governors* of their own homes. They are equally averse to the least restraint of discipline and to the least mental effort. He proposes rules for the regulation of his scholars' conduct; they sneer and take the first opportunity *openly* to transgress them. He reasons with them, but reasons in vain. He inflicts punishment, but he might as well inflict it on a stump, so calloused by punishment and so hardened by vice are many of his pupils, that he finds no avenues to their hearts. His mind is perpetually disconcerted by misdemeanors, and a great part of his attention is required to keep order.

He leaves at night, nervous and anxious, perhaps with a heavy and desponding heart. Such is the history of a day. The night's repose may restore his equilibrium, only to be again disturbed. Thus his term of a few weeks passes off. He takes the paltry sum allowed him for his services, and, likely as not, receives in addition (*gratis*) the reputation of keeping a school *good for nothing*.

J. B.

Rochester, N. H., 2nd mo., 1850.

#### GOOD TOOLS.

[From the Germantown Telegraph.]

MR. EDITOR,—I think that the old adage, that "He must indeed be a good workman who can afford to work with poor tools," is one which embodies an important truth. If we farmers employ a mechanic—a mason or a house carpenter, for instance—to execute a "job of work," we of course expect that he will come provided with proper and efficient tools. Should he come with but half the implements requisite for the proper and successful performance of the work confided to his hands, we should not hesitate to demur, and should be perfectly justified in dismissing him, and procuring another in his stead. But how is it on our farms? Are we

always as jealous and watchful of our interests there? How, often, indeed, is it, that our "helps" are required to plough, to mow, to reap and hoe, with implements which are not only "out of fashion," but too clumsy and ill adapted to the work required to be performed, to be used any where, except in places and under circumstances where those better adapted and constructed cannot be obtained. Many of the old-fashioned implements are still in use on our farms,—particularly ploughs, dung-forks, and hoes; and with these unwieldy and almost *unwieldable* abortions, hired men and boys are frequently required to perform as much work, and to finish it off as neatly, as though they were provided with the most proper tools. Farmers generally are too remiss on this point. They are too apt to look at the *cost of the tools*, not at the useless expenditure of strength on the part of the operative in wielding them:—*that* is no business of theirs, they think; but this is a fallacy. I have seen men in the hay-field, sweating and blowing, and exerting to the utmost every muscle, to satisfy the expectations and realize the demands, often exorbitant, of a parsimonious employer, who, with good tools, would have performed twice the amount of labor in the same period, without exhaustion and with comparative ease. The work also would have been done *effectually*, which is a matter of prime importance, though, by many, too often neglected and overlooked. The present abundance and cheapness of farming tools, of good quality, render it easy for every one who is so disposed, to obviate this great and long-existing evil.

A PRACTICAL FARMER.

[The above is a common-sense view of an important part of the wide field of human labor, but every word of it is just as applicable to *education* and to *schools* as to building and farming. Parents oblige teachers to work with bad books or no books, and without apparatus to illustrate principles, which no description can make clear to a child. Tools are as necessary to a teacher as to a farmer, and ignorant indeed is that community, which supposes that the withholding of them from the instructors of their children, is any thing but the most wretched economy.—Ed.]

---

#### WHAT YEAR IS IT?

In a late number of the Journal, we admitted an article signed *Chronos*, the object of which was to show that the year 1850 extended from 1849 to 1850 and not from 1850 to 1851, and, of course, that the present year is the beginning of the latter half of this century, and this first year of it will

be completed on the 31st of December ensuing. We did not care for the controversy, though it is not wholly without interest, and we inserted the article more for the sake of the grammatical remarks than for the question of chronology, which it contained.

Since the article was published, we have received three several articles in reply to it, with a request that we would not only publish them, but "give our own opinion." We can not think it will be profitable to publish the one, or give the other, but, as the latter course will take less room, we will venture to say, that, in our judgment, the positions of *Chronos* have not been shaken by the arguments of the trio. We believe with him that the 50th year of this century extended from the dawn of Jan. 1, 1849, to the close of Dec. 31, 1849, and the first day that followed, was the first of the first year of the second half of the century. Two of the writers *Aquila* and *Verus*, evidently misunderstood the statements of *Chronos*. *Verus* says, "Suppose *Chronos* had been born the first day of Jan. 1801, I would ask him, if he would have been 50 years of age the first day of Jan. 1850. Unless his name is a misnomer, he will readily perceive that he would not, unless he can make it appear that he was one year old the day he was born, and one would think from his reasoning that he believed he was." *Chronos*, we think, would not pretend that he was more than 49 years old, and he would say, he must have been born Jan. 1, 1800, to be 50 years old, Jan. 1, 1850.

*Aquila*, too, evidently commits a similar error. Referring to *Chronos*, he says, "He supposes that at the end of the first year of time, the great clock struck one. When it struck a hundred, the first century was completed. When the knell of time struck 50, fifty years were completed." "Now," says *Aquila*, "mark the conclusion; and the first day of January, 1850, was the 1st day of the 1st year of the last half of the 19th century?" The reasoning of *Aquila* which follows, shows that he does not understand *Chronos*, who, by the "1st day of Jan., 1850," evidently meant to speak in common language, which would be understood by all, although what is commonly called Jan. 1, 1850, is really Jan. 1, of the 51st year. If *Aquila* and *Verus* will begin at (0) and make twelve dots for the months, then write 1 after them, and after making twelve more dots, write 2 after them, and so go on till they write 50, they will find that, before they enter one dot into 50, they have completed 50 years. The first year extends from nothing to 1, the second from 1 to 2, and, by the same process, the 50th year extends from 49 to 50, but not into it. We have said thus much to show our

- esteemed correspondents that we have not overlooked their favors, and here the controversy must rest as far as the Journal is concerned.

### MAIDEN WORTH.


We copy the following exquisite gem from the Zanesville Gazette, but we know not whether it originated in that well conducted paper or not. It would be difficult to find lines more simply beautiful. May our fashionable young ladies lay them to heart.—Ed.

Her home was but a cottage home,  
A simple home, and small;  
Yet sweetness and affection made  
It seem a fairy hall.  
A little taste, a little care,  
Made humble things appear  
As though they were translated there  
From some superior sphere.  
Her home was but a cottage home,  
A simple home, and small,  
Yet sweetness and affection made  
It seem a fairy hall.


As sweet the home, so sweet the maid,  
As graceful and as good;  
She seemed a lily in the shade,  
A violet in the bud.  
She had no wealth but maiden worth,  
A wealth that's little fame;  
Yet that's the truest gold of earth,  
The other's but a name.  
Her home was but a cottage home,  
A simple home, and small,  
Yet sweetness and affection made  
It seem a fairy hall.

A cheerfulness of soul, that threw  
A smile o'er every task,  
A willingness that ever flew  
To serve ere one could ask;  
A something we could wish to own,  
An humble flow'ret, born  
To grace in its degree a throne,  
Or any rank adorn.  
Her home was but a cottage home,  
A simple home, and small,  
Yet sweetness and affection made  
It seem a fairy hall.

---

 All Communications, Newspapers, and Periodicals, for the Journal, should be addressed to Wm. B. Fowle, Editor, West Newton.

---

THE COMMON SCHOOL JOURNAL is regularly published, semi-monthly by LEMUEL N. IDE, 138½ Washington street, up stairs, (opposite School-street,) Boston.  Price, One Dollar a year, payable in advance, or \$1.25, if not paid before April 1.